

1 STEPHANIE M. HINDS (CABN 154284)  
2 United States Attorney  
3 MICHELLE LO (NYRN 432163p)  
Chief, Civil Division  
3 CHRISTOPHER F. JEU (CABN 247865)  
Assistant United States Attorney  
4

5 150 Almaden Boulevard, Suite 900  
6 San Jose, California 95113  
Telephone: (408) 535-5082  
7 Fax: (408) 535-5066  
christopher.jeu@usdoj.gov

8 Attorneys for Defendant  
United States of America  
9

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
12 SAN JOSE DIVISION

13 MAI-TRANG THI NGUYEN,

14 Plaintiff,

15 v.

16 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

17 Defendant,

18 Case No. 22-cv-00948-NC

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
**FEDERAL DEFENDANT'S  
NOTICE OF MOTION AND  
MOTION TO DISMISS;  
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND  
AUTHORITIES IN  
SUPPORT THEREOF**

Date: Wednesday, July 20, 2022  
Time: 1:00 p.m.  
Place: Courtroom 5, 4th Floor

Honorable Nathanael Cousins

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	2
<b>II.</b>	<b>LEGAL STANDARDS .....</b>	3
A.	Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1).....	3
B.	Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6).....	3
<b>III.</b>	<b>ARGUMENT .....</b>	4
A.	The Court Should Dismiss this Case Based on Res Judicata, Because Plaintiff Asserted Practically Identical Claims in a Prior Lawsuit that Was Adjudicated on the Merits.....	4
B.	The Court Should Dismiss this Election Case, Because Plaintiff Lacks Standing.....	6
1.	Plaintiff has no cognizable injury-in-fact, because the voting concerns are generalized grievances.....	7
2.	Plaintiff's alleged injury is not redressable, as the 2020 Presidential Election process has been completed.....	9
C.	Plaintiff's Lawsuit is Moot, as the 2020 Presidential Election is Done.....	10
D.	The Court Should Dismiss With Prejudice, Because Amendment Would Be Futile.....	11
<b>IV.</b>	<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	12

1 TABLE OF AUTHORITIES  
2

3 Page(s)

## 4 Cases

5 *Already, LLC v. Nike, Inc.*,  
6 568 U.S. 85 (2013)..... 107 *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*,  
8 556 U.S. 662 (2009)..... 49 *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*,  
10 550 U.S. 544 (2007)..... 411 *Bognet v. Sec'y Commonwealth of Pa.*,  
12 980 F.3d 336 (3d Cir. 2020)..... 813 *Bowyer v. Ducey*,  
14 506 F. Supp. 3d 699 (D. Ariz. 2020) ..... 8, 10, 1115 *Cervantes v. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc.*,  
16 656 F.3d 1034 (9th Cir. 2011) ..... 1117 *Consumer Fin. Prot. Bureau v. Gordon*,  
18 819 F.3d 1179 (9th Cir. 2016) ..... 819 *Donald J. Trump for President, Inc. v. Cegavske*,  
20 488 F. Supp. 3d 993 (D. Nev. 2020) ..... 821 *Ellis v. Circle K Corp.*, No. 19-cv-01145-PHX-SPL,  
22 2019 WL 10351581 (D. Ariz. Mar. 7, 2019) ..... 1123 *Feehan v. Wisconsin Elections Comm'n*,  
24 506 F. Supp. 3d 596 (E.D. Wis. Dec. 9, 2020) ..... 925 *Gallinger v. Becerra*,  
26 898 F.3d 1012 (9th Cir. 2018) ..... 1127 *Garity v. APWU Nat'l Lab. Org.*,  
28 828 F.3d 848 (9th Cir. 2016) ..... 529 *Hal Roach Studios, Inc. v. Richard Feiner & Co.*,  
30 896 F.2d 1542 (9th Cir. 1989) ..... 3, 431 *Hells Canyon Pres. Council v. U.S. Forest Serv.*,  
32 403 F.3d 683 (9th Cir. 2005) ..... 6

1	<i>Hernandez-Mora v. Garland</i> , No. 18-72129, 2022 WL 445523 (9th Cir. Feb. 14, 2022) .....	5
2		
3	<i>Hollingsworth v. Perry</i> , 570 U.S. 693 (2013).....	7
4		
5	<i>In re Castaic Partners II, LLC</i> , 823 F.3d 966 (9th Cir. 2016) .....	10
6		
7	<i>Jones v. Montague</i> , 194 U.S. 147 (1904).....	10, 11
8		
9	<i>Khoja v. Orexigen Therapeutics, Inc.</i> , 899 F.3d 988 (9th Cir. 2018) .....	4
10		
11	<i>King v. Whitmer</i> , 505 F. Supp. 3d 720 (E.D. Mich. 2020).....	10, 11
12		
13	<i>Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co.</i> , 511 U.S. 375 (1994).....	3
14		
15	<i>Lance v. Coffman</i> , 549 U.S. 437 (2007).....	7
16		
17	<i>Lee v. City of Los Angeles</i> , 250 F.3d 668 (9th Cir. 2001) .....	2
18		
19	<i>Lenk v. Monolithic Power Sys., Inc.</i> , No. 20-cv-08094-BLF, 2021 WL 5233078 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 10, 2021) .....	4, 5, 6
20		
21	<i>Lucky Brand Dungarees, Inc. v. Marcel Fashions Grp., Inc.</i> , 140 S. Ct. 1589 (2020).....	4, 5
22		
23	<i>Lujan v. Defs. of Wildlife</i> , 504 U.S. 555 (1992).....	7, 8
24		
25	<i>Murphy v. Hunt</i> , 455 U.S. 478 (1982).....	10
26		
27	<i>Nguyen v. United States</i> , No. 20-cv-08755-NC, 2022 WL 822435 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 11, 2022).....	6, 7, 9, 10
28		
	<i>O'Rourke v. Dominion Voting Sys.</i> , No. 20-cv-3747-NRN, 2021 WL 1662742 (D. Colo. Apr. 28, 2021).....	9
	<i>Paher v. Cegavske</i> , 457 F. Supp. 3d 919 (D. Nev. 2020).....	8
	FEDERAL DEF.'S MOTION TO DISMISS CASE NO. 22-CV-00948-NC	

1	<i>Parabia v. State Bank of Texas</i> , No. 19-cv-0725-BEN-MSB, 2020 WL 4436352 (S.D. Cal. Aug. 3, 2020) .....	11
2		
3	<i>Santos v. Office Depot, Inc.</i> , No. 19-55906, 816 F. App'x 183 (9th Cir. 2020) .....	2
4		
5	<i>Saul v. United States</i> 928 F.2d 829 (9th Cir. 1991) .....	11
6		
7	<i>SmileCare Dental Grp. v. Delta Dental Plan of Cal., Inc.</i> , 88 F.3d 780 (9th Cir. 1996) .....	3
8		
9	<i>Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins</i> , 578 U.S. 330 (2016).....	7
10		
11	<i>Stewart v. U.S. Bancorp</i> , 297 F.3d 953 (9th Cir. 2002) .....	6
12		
13	<i>Texas v. Pennsylvania</i> , 141 S. Ct. 1230 (2020).....	8, 9
14		
15	<i>United States v. Lazarenko</i> , 476 F.3d 642 (9th Cir. 2007) .....	8
16		
17	<i>United States v. Richardson</i> , 418 U.S. 166 (1974).....	7
18		
19	<i>Wells Fargo &amp; Co. v. Wells Fargo Exp. Co.</i> , 556 F.2d 406 (9th Cir. 1977) .....	3
20		
21	<i>Whitewater Draw Nat. Res. Conservation Dist. v. Mayorkas</i> , 5 F.4th 997 (9th Cir. 2021) .....	6, 7
22		
23	<i>Wood v. Raffensperger</i> , 981 F.3d 1307 (11th Cir. 2020) .....	8, 10
24		
25	Rules	
26		
27	<i>Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1).....</i>	1, 3
28	<i>Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6).....</i>	1, 3
29		
30	Other Authorities	
31		
32	<i>Civ. L.R. 7.....</i>	1
33		
34		
35		
36		
37		
38		
39		
40		
41		
42		
43		
44		
45		
46		
47		
48		
49		
50		
51		
52		
53		
54		
55		
56		
57		
58		
59		
60		
61		
62		
63		
64		
65		
66		
67		
68		
69		
70		
71		
72		
73		
74		
75		
76		
77		
78		
79		
80		
81		
82		
83		
84		
85		
86		
87		
88		
89		
90		
91		
92		
93		
94		
95		
96		
97		
98		
99		
100		
101		
102		
103		
104		
105		
106		
107		
108		
109		
110		
111		
112		
113		
114		
115		
116		
117		
118		
119		
120		
121		
122		
123		
124		
125		
126		
127		
128		
129		
130		
131		
132		
133		
134		
135		
136		
137		
138		
139		
140		
141		
142		
143		
144		
145		
146		
147		
148		
149		
150		
151		
152		
153		
154		
155		
156		
157		
158		
159		
160		
161		
162		
163		
164		
165		
166		
167		
168		
169		
170		
171		
172		
173		
174		
175		
176		
177		
178		
179		
180		
181		
182		
183		
184		
185		
186		
187		
188		
189		
190		
191		
192		
193		
194		
195		
196		
197		
198		
199		
200		
201		
202		
203		
204		
205		
206		
207		
208		
209		
210		
211		
212		
213		
214		
215		
216		
217		
218		
219		
220		
221		
222		
223		
224		
225		
226		
227		
228		
229		
230		
231		
232		
233		
234		
235		
236		
237		
238		
239		
240		
241		
242		
243		
244		
245		
246		
247		
248		
249		
250		
251		
252		
253		
254		
255		
256		
257		
258		
259		
260		
261		
262		
263		
264		
265		
266		
267		
268		
269		
270		
271		
272		
273		
274		
275		
276		
277		
278		
279		
280		
281		
282		
283		
284		
285		
286		
287		
288		
289		
290		
291		
292		
293		
294		
295		
296		
297		
298		
299		
300		
301		
302		
303		
304		
305		
306		
307		
308		
309		
310		
311		
312		
313		
314		
315		
316		
317		
318		
319		
320		
321		
322		
323		
324		
325		
326		
327		
328		
329		
330		
331		
332		
333		
334		
335		
336		
337		
338		
339		
340		
341		
342		
343		
344		
345		
346		
347		
348		
349		
350		
351		
352		
353		
354		
355		
356		
357		
358		
359		
360		
361		
362		
363		
364		
365		
366		
367		
368		
369		
370		
371		
372		
373		
374		
375		
376		
377		
378		
379		
380		
381		
382		
383		
384		
385		
386		
387		
388		
389		
390		
391		
392		
393		
394		
395		
396		
397		
398		
399		
400		
401		
402		
403		
404		
405		
406		
407		
408		
409		
410		
411		
412		
413		
414		
415		
416		
417		
418		
419		
420		
421		
422		
423		
424		
425		
426		
427		
428		
429		
430		
431		
432		
433		
434		
435		
436		
437		
438		
439		
440		
441		
442		
443		
444		
445		
446		
447		
448		
449		
450		
451		
452		
453		
454		
455		
456		
457		
458		
459		
460		
461		
462		
463		
464		
465		
466		
467		
468		
469		
470		
471		
472		
473		
474		
475		
476		
477		
478		
479		
480		
481		
482		
483		
484		
485		
486		
487		
488		
489		
490		
491		
492		
493		
494		
495		
496		
497		
498		
499		
500		
501		
502		
503		
504		
505		
506		
507		
508		
509		
510		
511		
512		
513		
514</		

## **NOTICE OF MOTION**

TO PLAINTIFF, APPEARING IN PRO PER:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that, on Wednesday, July 20, 2022, at 1:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard in Courtroom 5, 4th Floor, United States Courthouse, 280 South First Street, San Jose, California, the Honorable Nathanael Cousins presiding, Defendant United States of America will appear and move the Court pursuant to Rules 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (“FRCP”) for an order dismissing the Complaint (ECF No. 1) with prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and failure to state a claim.

**NOTICE OF DUE DATE FOR PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSIVE BRIEF**

TO PLAINTIFF, APPEARING IN PRO PER:

Pursuant to Civil L.R. 7-3(a), within 14 days of filing of this motion (*i.e.*, June 27, 2022), Plaintiff's opposition or other response to this motion must be filed with the Court.

## **RELIEF SOUGHT BY DEFENDANT**

Defendant seeks an order dismissing the claims against it with prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and failure to state a claim.

## **ISSUES TO BE DETERMINED**

1. Whether Plaintiff's claims, which were previously adjudicated by this Court in a practically identical lawsuit, should be dismissed under principles of res judicata.
2. Whether Plaintiff has Article III standing to allege generalized voter grievances.
3. Whether Plaintiff's lawsuit is moot, as the 2020 Presidential Election processes have been long concluded.

# MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

## I. INTRODUCTION

3 In this Federal Tort Claims Act case (“*Nguyen II*”), Plaintiff Mai-Trang Thi Nguyen  
4 (“Plaintiff” or “Ms. Nguyen”) seeks a “recount-recheck” of the 2020 Presidential Election and  
5 financial damages. *See* Compl. (ECF No. 1) at 1:23-25, 2:20-22, 4:14-16 and 13:5-7. In the Complaint,  
6 Plaintiff contends that in the 2020 Presidential Election, for the “[f]irst time in the history of America,  
7 voters [could] vote in the comfort of their homes and simply drop their votes into their mail boxes;” and  
8 that “[t]his new voting system was America’s answer for voting during the pandemic to prevent the  
9 spread of Covid-19.” *Id.* at 4:5-10. Plaintiff asserts that although “the experts confirmed that this new  
10 voting system” was “successful” and had “very little fraud[],” “there was no recount-recheck conducted  
11 in battleground states or across America.” *Id.* at 4:14-16. Thus, Plaintiff alleges that the United States  
12 negligently conducted the 2020 Presidential Election, as “[a] recount-recheck in battleground states”  
13 would be the “only system” that can repair the defects in the proverbial “new product.” *Id.* at 10:4-23.  
14 In the demand for relief, Plaintiff seeks “\$1 trillion for her mental injury,” but she is willing to “return it  
15 upon receiving the money.” *Id.* at 19:5-7.

16        This is not the first time that Plaintiff has filed a lawsuit to challenge the  
17 2020 Presidential Election. In a prior Federal Tort Claims Act (“FTCA”) lawsuit, Plaintiff also sought a  
18 recount of the 2020 Presidential Election. *See* Case No. 20-cv-8755-NC (N.D. Cal.) (“*Nguyen I*”),  
19 Third. Am. Compl. (ECF No. 23) at 1, 3-4 and 6.<sup>1</sup> In the *Nguyen I* litigation, Plaintiff alleged that “[t]he  
20 United States committed a treason when it stated a lie that the coronavirus-infected Presidential Election  
21 of 2020 was ‘100% secure[]’/had ‘very little fraud[]’/and had ‘no massive fraud.’” *Id.* at 6:1-4. In  
22 *Nguyen I*, Plaintiff likewise asserted that there should have been a “recount-recheck,” as the 2020  
23 Presidential Election involved the “first launch of the nationwide mass-mail-out-ballots.” *Id.* at 6:5-8.  
24 In *Nguyen I*, Plaintiff alleged that “\$1,000,000,000” was in controversy, but Plaintiff was willing to

<sup>26</sup> 1 Defendant respectfully requests that the Court take judicial notice of the pleadings filed in Case  
27 No. 20-cv-8755-NC, including the Third Amended Complaint (ECF No. 23). *See Santos v. Office*  
28 *Depot, Inc.*, No. 19-55906, 816 F. App'x 183 (9th Cir. 2020) (mem.) (the “court may take judicial notice  
of matters of public record”) (citing *Lee v. City of Los Angeles*, 250 F.3d 668, 689 (9th Cir. 2001).)

1 “refuse any financial compensation if the U.S. does its job,” such as by ordering “recount[s] in  
 2 battleground states.” *Id.* at 4.

3 The Court should dismiss Plaintiff’s Complaint for multiple reasons. First, the Court should  
 4 dismiss Plaintiff’s suit on res judicata grounds. In the *Nguyen I* and *Nguyen II* lawsuits, Plaintiff has  
 5 asserted practically identical claims. In addition, in *Nguyen I*, there was a final judgment on the merits.  
 6 Last, the parties were identical in both lawsuits.

7 Second, Plaintiff lacks Article III standing to bring this election lawsuit, because her claims are  
 8 based on generalized grievances. Plaintiff has not suffered a legally cognizable injury-in-fact.  
 9 Likewise, Plaintiff’s claims are not redressable and moot, because the 2020 Presidential Election  
 10 processes have been completed. Last, the Court should dismiss with prejudice, because the defects in  
 11 Plaintiff’s claims cannot be cured by amendment.

12 **II. LEGAL STANDARDS**

13 **A. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1)**

14 Dismissal under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1) is required where the court lacks  
 15 jurisdiction. “Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction.” *Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co.*,  
 16 511 U.S. 375, 377 (1994). “They possess only that power authorized by Constitution and statute[.]” *Id.*  
 17 “It is to be presumed that a cause lies outside this limited jurisdiction, and the burden of establishing the  
 18 contrary rests upon the party asserting jurisdiction.” *Id.* (internal citations omitted). “[P]laintiffs bear  
 19 the burden both of making an initial, *prima facie* showing of jurisdictional facts at the pleading stage and  
 20 of proving those facts by a preponderance at trial.” *Wells Fargo & Co. v. Wells Fargo Exp. Co.*, 556  
 21 F.2d 406, 430 n.24 (9th Cir. 1977).

22 **B. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6)**

23 Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) permits dismissal for “failure to state a claim upon which relief can be  
 24 granted.” Dismissal may be based on either: (1) “lack of a cognizable legal theory,” or (2) “insufficient  
 25 facts under a cognizable legal claim.” *SmileCare Dental Grp. v. Delta Dental Plan of Cal., Inc.*, 88 F.3d  
 26 780, 783 (9th Cir. 1996) (citations omitted). Review is limited to the contents of the complaint,  
 27 including its properly submitted exhibits. *See Hal Roach Studios, Inc. v. Richard Feiner & Co.*, 896

1 F.2d 1542, 1555 n.19 (9th Cir. 1989). In addition, the “court may take judicial notice of matters of  
 2 public record without converting a motion to dismiss into a motion for summary judgment.” *Khoja v.*  
 3 *Orexigen Therapeutics, Inc.*, 899 F.3d 988, 999 (9th Cir. 2018), *cert. denied sub nom. Hagan v. Khoja*,  
 4 139 S. Ct. 2615 (2019).

5 “To survive a motion to dismiss, a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as  
 6 true, to ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)  
 7 (citing *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)). To meet the facial plausibility  
 8 standard, a plaintiff must plead factual content that “allows the court to draw the reasonable inference  
 9 that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678 (citing *Twombly*, 550  
 10 U.S. at 556). “Where a complaint pleads facts that are ‘merely consistent with’ a defendant’s liability, it  
 11 ‘stops short of the line between possibility and plausibility of ‘entitlement to relief.’” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at  
 12 678 (citing *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 557). “[A] plaintiff’s obligation to provide the ‘grounds’ of his  
 13 ‘entitle[ment] to relief’ requires more than labels and conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of the  
 14 elements of a cause of action will not do.” *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555 (citation omitted).

15 **III. ARGUMENT**

16       **A. The Court Should Dismiss this Case Based on Res Judicata, Because Plaintiff  
 17           Asserted Practically Identical Claims in a Prior Lawsuit that Was Adjudicated on  
 18           the Merits.**

19       The Court should dismiss Plaintiff’s Complaint, because Plaintiff has already litigated  
 20 2020 Presidential Election claims, and Plaintiff is bound by those prior legal determination.

21       The term res judicata “comprises two distinct doctrines regarding the preclusive effect of prior  
 22 litigation.” *Lucky Brand Dungarees, Inc. v. Marcel Fashions Grp., Inc.*, 140 S. Ct. 1589, 1594 (2020).  
 23 “The first is issue preclusion (sometimes called collateral estoppel), which precludes a party from  
 24 relitigating an issue actually decided in a prior case and necessary to the judgment.” *Id.* (citations  
 25 omitted). “The second doctrine is claim preclusion (sometimes itself called res judicata).” *Id.* “Unlike  
 26 issue preclusion, claim preclusion prevents parties from raising issues that could have been raised and  
 27 decided in a prior action—even if they were not actually litigated.” *Id.*

28       “Res judicata applies when there is: (1) an identity of claims; (2) a final judgment on the merits;

1 and (3) identity or privity between parties.” *Lenk v. Monolithic Power Sys., Inc.*, No. 20-cv-08094-BLF,  
 2 2021 WL 5233078, at \*4 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 10, 2021) (citing *Lucky Brand Dungarees, Inc.* 140 S. Ct. at  
 3 1594), *appeal dismissed*, No. 21-17035, 2022 WL 2062162 (9th Cir. Apr. 8, 2022). *See Hernandez-*  
 4 *Mora v. Garland*, No. 18-72129, 2022 WL 445523, at \*1 (9th Cir. Feb. 14, 2022) (same res judicata  
 5 elements) (citing *Garity v. APWU Nat'l Lab. Org.*, 828 F.3d 848, 855 (9th Cir. 2016).) “The central  
 6 criterion in determining whether there is an identity of claims between the first and second adjudications  
 7 is whether the two suits arise out of the same transactional nucleus of facts.” *Lenk*, 2021 WL 5233078,  
 8 at \*4 (citing *Owens v. Kaiser Found. Health Plan, Inc.*, 244 F.3d 708, 714 (9th Cir. 2001)).

9 First, Defendant has satisfied the identity of claims requirement. Both *Nguyen I* and *Nguyen II*  
 10 arise from the “same transactional nucleus of facts.” *Lenk*, 2021 WL 5233078, at \*4. In both lawsuits,  
 11 Ms. Nguyen raises practically identical challenges to the 2020 Presidential Election. *Compare Nguyen*  
 12 *II*, Compl. (ECF No. 1) at 3:24-26 and 4:7-16 (alleging that the “2020 United States Presidential  
 13 Election became the first election in America to occur in a pandemic (COVID-19 or Coronavirus  
 14 pandemic),” and that “there was no recount-recheck conducted in battleground states”); with *Nguyen I*,  
 15 Third Am. Compl. (ECF No. 23) at 6:1-6 (alleging that “[t]he United States committed a treason when it  
 16 stated a lie that the coronavirus-infected Presidential Election of 2020 was ‘100% secured’/had ‘very  
 17 little fraud[]’/had ‘no massive fraud’ because they never conducted a recount-recheck”). Accordingly,  
 18 in both *Nguyen I* and *Nguyen II*, Plaintiff asserted that in the course of the 2020 Presidential Election,  
 19 there should have been a “recount-recheck.”

20 Both *Nguyen* lawsuits arise from Plaintiff’s criticism of mail-in-balloting. In *Nguyen I*, Plaintiff  
 21 alleged that the 2020 Presidential Election involved the “first launch of the nationwide mass-mail-out-  
 22 ballots and mass-mail-in ballot application system,” so the United States should have “conducted a  
 23 recount-recheck,” in order to ensure the “system work[ed] properly.” *Nguyen I*, Third. Am. Compl.  
 24 (ECF No. 23) at 6:6-9. Accordingly, Plaintiff asserted that “whenever there is a new process in the  
 25 system, we have to double check & triple check.” *Id.* at 4.

26 In *Nguyen II*, Plaintiff likewise challenges whether “the U.S. government did a proper job in  
 27 launching its new product (the new voting system that allowed voters to vote by mail).” *Nguyen II*,

1 Compl. (ECF No. 1) at 4:20-24. Plaintiff further alleges that when “launching a new product,” “extra  
 2 things” have to be performed to “make sure the new product works properly.” *Id.* at 7:7-10. Thus, in  
 3 both lawsuits, Plaintiff alleges that the 2020 Presidential Election was negligently conducted, due to the  
 4 purported failure to conduct a recount-recheck in battleground states. *Compare Nguyen I*, Third Am.  
 5 Compl. (ECF No. 23) at 4 and 6:1-9 and 6:19-26) *with Nguyen II*, Compl. (ECF No. 1) at 4:8-16, 8:3-11,  
 6 10:4-23, 12:11-18, 17:4-7).

7 Second, there was “final judgment on the merits” in *Nguyen I*. *Lenk*, 2021 WL 5233078, at \*4.  
 8 “The phrase ‘final judgment on the merits’ is often used interchangeably with ‘dismissal with  
 9 prejudice.’” *Stewart v. U.S. Bancorp*, 297 F.3d 953, 956 (9th Cir. 2002). *See Hells Canyon Pres.*  
 10 *Council v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 403 F.3d 683, 686 (9th Cir. 2005) (“[F]inal judgment on the merits’ is  
 11 synonymous with ‘dismissal with prejudice.’”) (citations omitted). In *Nguyen I*, this Court dismissed  
 12 Plaintiff’s Third Amended Complaint with prejudice. *Nguyen v. United States*, No. 20-cv-08755-NC,  
 13 2022 WL 822435, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 11, 2022). This Court reasoned that “[b]ecause Plaintiff has  
 14 already amended her complaint three times without curing the deficiencies, the Court finds that granting  
 15 further amendment would be futile.” *Id.* Thus, the second element is also satisfied in this case.

16 Third, there was “identity or privity between parties.” *Lenk*, 2021 WL 5233078, at \*4.  
 17 In *Nguyen I*, Ms. Nguyen brought suit against the United States. *See Nguyen I*, Third Am. Compl. (ECF  
 18 No. 23) at 1 and 4 (plaintiff: “Mai-Trang Thi Nguyen,” of Hollenbeck Avenue, Sunnyvale; defendant:  
 19 “the United States”). In *Nguyen II*, Ms. Nguyen has again brought suit against the United States. *See*  
 20 *Nguyen II*, Compl. (ECF No. 1) at 1-2 (plaintiff: “Mai-Trang Thi Nguyen,” of Hollenbeck Avenue,  
 21 Sunnyvale; defendant: “The United States”). Both lawsuits involve the same parties. Thus, the third  
 22 requirement has been satisfied. Thus, the Court should dismiss Plaintiff’s Complaint due to res judicata.

23 **B. The Court Should Dismiss this Election Case, Because Plaintiff Lacks Standing.**

24 Alternatively, the Court should dismiss this case for the same reasons that it dismissed *Nguyen I*:  
 25 lack of standing and mootness. *Nguyen*, 2022 WL 822435, at \*1-2. The United States first addresses  
 26 Plaintiff’s lack of standing.

1       In order to avoid dismissal on standing grounds, a plaintiff must show (1) that she has “suffered  
 2 an injury in fact” that is (a) “concrete and particularized” and (b) “actual or imminent, not conjectural or  
 3 hypothetical”; (2) that the injury is “fairly traceable to the challenged action of the defendant”; and (3) it  
 4 is “likely, as opposed to merely speculative, that the injury will be redressed by a favorable decision.”  
 5 *Whitewater Draw Nat. Res. Conservation Dist. v. Mayorkas*, 5 F.4th 997, 1012 (9th Cir. 2021) (citing  
 6 *Lujan v. Defs. of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 560-61 (1992)).

7           **1. Plaintiff has no cognizable injury-in-fact, because the voting concerns are  
 8 generalized grievances.**

9       Plaintiff cannot establish a legally cognizable injury-in-fact sufficient to maintain any claim  
 10 against the United States, because the alleged injuries are non-cognizable generalized grievances – the  
 11 kind of injury “that is ‘plainly undifferentiated and common to all members of the public.’” *Lance v.*  
 12 *Coffman*, 549 U.S. 437, 440-41 (2007) (quoting *United States v. Richardson*, 418 U.S. 166, 176-77  
 13 (1974)); *see also Hollingsworth v. Perry*, 570 U.S. 693, 706 (2013) (explaining that “a ‘generalized  
 14 grievance,’ no matter how sincere,” cannot support standing).

15       In this case, Plaintiff has not alleged a particular, concrete injury. *See Whitewater Draw Nat.*  
 16 *Res. Conservation Dist.*, 5 F.4th at 1012. Rather, Plaintiff alleges in the course of the 2020 Presidential  
 17 Election, “duplicated voting ballots” were “sent out by mail,” so “[d]ead people could vote” and a “voter  
 18 can cast 4 votes.” *Nguyen II*, Compl. (ECF No. 1) at 7:14-25. Plaintiff apparently contends that due to  
 19 potential errors in the 2020 Presidential Election, voter dilution was possible.

20       This is the type of alleged abstract injury that cannot satisfy Article III standing. *See Spokeo,*  
 21 *Inc. v. Robins*, 578 U.S. 330, 339-40 (2016); *Lujan*, 504 U.S. at 573-74 (a “generally available grievance  
 22 about government—claiming only harm to his and every citizen’s interest in proper application of the  
 23 Constitution and laws . . . does not state an Article III case or controversy”). Plaintiff’s interest in the  
 24 2020 Presidential Election is no different from that of any other voter.

25       In *Nguyen I*, this Court properly held that “Plaintiff fail[ed] to establish standing because she  
 26 [did] not allege a cognizable injury or redressability.” *Nguyen*, 2022 WL 822435, at \*1. Plaintiff’s  
 27 alleged injury was not “concrete or particularized,” as “[s]uch a ‘generally available grievance about

1 government—claiming only harm to [the plaintiff’s] and every citizen’s interest in proper application of  
 2 the Constitution and laws, and seeking relief that no more directly and tangibly benefits [them] than it  
 3 does the public at large’ is insufficient to establish standing.” *Id.* (citing *Lujan*, 504 U.S. at 573-74).

4       Likewise, other Ninth Circuit courts have rejected similar voter dilution claims, because the  
 5 purported injuries were not concrete or particularized. *See, e.g., Paher v. Cegavske*, 457 F. Supp. 3d  
 6 919, 926 (D. Nev. 2020) (finding that “Plaintiffs’ purported injury of having their votes diluted due to  
 7 ostensible election fraud may be conceivably raised by any Nevada voter. Such claimed injury therefore  
 8 does not satisfy the requirement that Plaintiffs must state a concrete and particularized injury.”); *Donald*  
 9 *J. Trump for President, Inc. v. Cegavske*, 488 F. Supp. 3d 993, 1000 (D. Nev. 2020) (finding that alleged  
 10 injuries due to “vote dilution” were “speculative” and not “particularized”); *Bowyer v. Ducey*, 506 F.  
 11 Supp. 3d 699, 711-12 (D. Ariz. 2020) (voter dilution “allegations are nothing more than generalized  
 12 grievances that any . . . who voted could make if they were so allowed” and collecting cases).

13       Likewise, multiple Courts of Appeals have found that plaintiffs had not satisfied the injury-in-  
 14 fact requirement in 2020 Presidential Election cases. *See Wood v. Raffensperger*, 981 F.3d 1307, 1314-  
 15 15 (11th Cir. 2020) (holding that plaintiff’s injury of vote dilution based on his interest in compliance  
 16 with state election laws “is a ‘paradigmatic generalized grievance that cannot support standing’”), *cert.*  
 17 *denied*, 141 S. Ct. 1379 (2021); *Bogner v. Sec’y Commonwealth of Pa.*, 980 F.3d 336, 354, 356 (3d Cir.  
 18 2020) (dismissing similar Equal Protection and Elections Clause claims for lack of standing and holding  
 19 that “state actors counting ballots in violation of state election law . . . is not a concrete harm under the  
 20 Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment”), *cert. granted and remanded with instructions*  
 21 *to dismiss as moot*, 141 S. Ct. 2508 (Apr. 19, 2021). *Cf. Consumer Fin. Prot. Bureau v. Gordon*, 819  
 22 F.3d 1179, 1187 (9th Cir. 2016) (“A generalized grievance is not enough; a plaintiff must have more  
 23 than merely an interest in seeing the law obeyed.”).

24       In addition, Plaintiff has a prudential standing problem. “Prudential standing encompasses ‘the  
 25 general prohibition on a litigant’s raising another person’s legal rights.’” *United States v. Lazarenko*, 476  
 26 F.3d 642, 649-50 (9th Cir. 2007) (citation and quotation marks omitted). *Cf. Texas v. Pennsylvania*, 141  
 27 S. Ct. 1230 (2020) (mem.) (“Texas has not demonstrated a judicially cognizable interest in the manner

1 in which another State conducts its elections.”). In this case, Plaintiff’s concerns reach how other states  
 2 conducted the 2020 Presidential Election. *See Nguyen II*, Compl. (ECF No. 1) at 8:7-1` (“No recount-  
 3 recheck was conducted in razor-thin battleground states in which ballot-by-mail votes dictated the  
 4 outcome of the election.”).

5 Indeed, many additional courts have rejected standing based on similar allegations that  
 6 plaintiffs—as voters—were discouraged to vote, concerned about the election results, or felt their votes  
 7 were diluted or diminished by the fact that others were allowed to vote or engage in election-related  
 8 speech. *See, e.g., Feehan v. Wisconsin Elections Comm’n*, 506 F. Supp. 3d 596, 608-09 (E.D. Wis. Dec.  
 9 9, 2020) (finding no particularized, concrete injury in 2020 Presidential Election case), *appeal*  
 10 *dismissed*, No. 20-3396, 2020 WL 9936901 (7th Cir. Dec. 21, 2020); *O’Rourke v. Dominion Voting Sys.*,  
 11 No. 20-cv-3747-NRN, 2021 WL 1662742, at \*4-11 (D. Colo. Apr. 28, 2021) (finding that “Plaintiffs’  
 12 claimed injuries are general, unparticularized, and shared with every other registered voter in America”),  
 13 aff’d, No. 21-1161, 2022 WL 1699425 (10th Cir. May 27, 2022). Plaintiff does not have a legally  
 14 cognizable injury.

15 **2. Plaintiff’s alleged injury is not redressable, as the 2020 Presidential Election  
 16 process has been completed.**

17 Plaintiff’s alleged injury related to the 2020 Presidential Election results is not redressable. Even  
 18 if Plaintiff could establish that the meritless claims asserted more than generalized grievances, Plaintiff  
 19 has not established that the Court can redress the claims.

20 In *Nguyen I*, this Court properly held that Plaintiff’s alleged injuries were not redressable.  
 21 *Nguyen*, 2022 WL 822435, at \*2. “The Court cannot provide this [requested] redress. Recounting the  
 22 votes from the 2020 Presidential Election would require decertifying the results that have already been  
 23 certified, submitted to the Electoral College, and acted upon. The relief Plaintiff seeks is ‘beyond this  
 24 court’s ability to redress absent the mythical time machine.’” *Id.* (citing *Feehan*, 506 F. Supp. 3d at  
 25 615).

26 Likewise, in this case, the relief Plaintiff apparently seeks, which would include de-certifying the  
 27 results of the 2020 Presidential Election, would disenfranchise not only Plaintiff’s vote, but also the  
 28

1 nearly 160 million others who voted in the 2020 Presidential Election. *See King v. Whitmer*, 505 F.  
 2 Supp. 3d 720, 735 (E.D. Mich. 2020) (“Plaintiffs’ alleged injury does not entitle them to seek their  
 3 requested remedy because the harm of having one’s vote invalidated or diluted is not remedied by  
 4 denying millions of others *their* right to vote.”), *appeal dismissed*, No. 20-2205, 2021 WL 688804 (6th  
 5 Cir. Jan. 26, 2021).

6 **C. Plaintiff’s Lawsuit is Moot, as the 2020 Presidential Election is Done.**

7 Moreover, this case should be dismissed on mootness grounds. In *Nguyen I*, this Court  
 8 succinctly held that “Plaintiff’s claim is also moot.” *Nguyen*, 2022 WL 822435, at \*2. This Court  
 9 reasoned, “[i]n the case of challenges to the 2020 Presidential Election, courts ‘cannot turn back the  
 10 clock’ and order a recount because the results of the election are already final and certified.” *Id.* (citing  
 11 *Wood*, 981 F.3d at 1317; *King*, 505 F. Supp. 3d at 729-30; and *Bowyer*, 506 F. Supp. 3d at 719-20).

12 Indeed, even before Plaintiff filed *Nguyen II* case, the electors had cast their votes, Congress  
 13 confirmed those votes, and President Biden was sworn into office. To the extent there was ever any  
 14 possibility that this Court could grant Plaintiff’s requested relief, there no longer is, and thus mootness  
 15 strips this Court of subject-matter jurisdiction. *See Already, LLC v. Nike, Inc.*, 568 U.S. 85, 91 (2013)  
 16 (explaining that a case becomes moot “when the issues presented are no longer ‘live’ or the parties lack  
 17 a legally cognizable interest in the outcome” (quoting *Murphy v. Hunt*, 455 U.S. 478, 481 (1982) (per  
 18 curiam)). *See In re Castaic Partners II, LLC*, 823 F.3d 966, 968 (9th Cir. 2016) (“Constitutional  
 19 mootness is jurisdictional and derives from the case-or-controversy requirement of Article III.”)

20 In the context of election matters, the Supreme Court has held that a case is moot when the  
 21 challenged procedure has already been performed. In *Jones v. Montague*, the plaintiffs sued the Virginia  
 22 governor and the Secretary of the Commonwealth requesting an injunction of an election canvass. *Jones*  
 23 *v. Montague*, 194 U.S. 147, 153 (1904). The Supreme Court rejected their challenge, holding that the  
 24 case was moot because “the thing sought to be prohibited has been done, and cannot be undone by any  
 25 order of court.” *Id.*

26 As this Court has recognized, other courts analyzing the 2020 Presidential Election have reached  
 27 similar conclusions. *See, e.g., Wood*, 981 F.3d at 1316-18 (finding requests for recount and to delay

1 certification moot, and finding that “new recount” would not be meaningful as the “results are already  
 2 final and certified”); *King*, 505 F. Supp. 3d at 729-31 (finding that “[t]he time has passed to provide  
 3 most of the relief Plaintiffs request” and that “the remaining relief is beyond the power of any court”);  
 4 *Bowyer*, 506 F. Supp. 3d at 720 (finding that as the federal court did not have the power to de-certify  
 5 election results, “it would be meaningless to grant Plaintiffs any of the remaining relief they seek.”).

6 There is simply no actual, ongoing case or controversy pertaining to the 2020 Presidential  
 7 Election for this Court to decide. The states have already counted their votes; the 2020 Presidential  
 8 Election has been certified; and President Biden was inaugurated. The 2020 Presidential Election  
 9 cannot be “decertified” for additional recounts in battleground states. Thus, Plaintiff’s claims should be  
 10 dismissed as moot. *See Jones*, 194 U.S. at 153.

11 **D. The Court Should Dismiss With Prejudice, Because Amendment Would Be Futile.**

12 The Court should dismiss Plaintiff’s operative complaint with prejudice, because Plaintiff cannot  
 13 save the complaint through amendment. “Although leave to amend should be given freely, a district  
 14 court may dismiss without leave where a plaintiff’s proposed amendments would fail to cure the  
 15 pleading deficiencies and amendment would be futile.” *Cervantes v. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc.*,  
 16 656 F.3d 1034, 1041 (9th Cir. 2011). *See Saul v. United States*, 928 F.2d 829, 843 (9th Cir. 1991);  
 17 *Gallinger v. Becerra*, 898 F.3d 1012, 1022 n.10 (9th Cir. 2018).

18 Plaintiff cannot cure the defects of this lawsuit, so amendment would be futile. For instance,  
 19 Plaintiff’s claims are barred by principles of res judicata, so the deficiencies in the Complaint are not  
 20 curable. *See Parabia v. State Bank of Texas*, No. 19-cv-0725-BEN-MSB, 2020 WL 4436352, at \*2  
 21 (S.D. Cal. Aug. 3, 2020) (“Because the disposition of Parabia’s claims in this case are dependent upon  
 22 the claims in and the outcome of 14-cv-3031-L (DHB), Parabia cannot cure the deficiencies in the  
 23 current Complaint. Therefore, this case is dismissed with prejudice.”); *Ellis v. Circle K Corp.*, No. 19-  
 24 cv-01145-PHX-SPL, 2019 WL 10351581, at \*2 (D. Ariz. Mar. 7, 2019) (dismissing case with prejudice  
 25 on res judicata grounds). As Plaintiff cannot cure the fatal defects through amendment, the Court should

1 dismiss with prejudice.

2 **IV. CONCLUSION**

3 For the foregoing reasons, the United States request that the Court dismiss the Complaint  
4 with prejudice.

5 Respectfully submitted,

6 STEPHANIE M. HINDS  
7 United States Attorney

8 Dated: June 13, 2022

9 By: /s/ Christopher F. Jeu  
10 CHRISTOPHER F. JEU  
11 Assistant United States Attorney  
12 Attorneys for Defendant  
13 United States of America